

REMARKS

Claims 21, 22, 52 and 53 are pending in the application.

Claims 21, 22, 52 and 53 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Leung (U.S. 6,487,605). The Leung reference was previously cited in the Office Action of April 20, 2005.

Applicant's claim 21, for example, includes the features of:

"In a proxy correspondent node provided between a correspondent terminal and a home agent, a method of providing a communication service to a correspondent terminal that communicates with a mobile terminal, said method conducted by the proxy correspondent node comprising the steps of:

hunting binding information about the mobile terminal, the binding information being information which provides a correspondence between an IP address of the mobile terminal and an IP address of a foreign agent that is accommodating the mobile terminal and the binding information being transferred from the home agent of the mobile terminal to the correspondent terminal;

processing and storing the binding information for the correspondent terminal; and

processing a data packet from the correspondent terminal to the mobile terminal based on the binding information."

In the Office Action column 11, lines 48-67 of Leung is pointed to for describing applicant's claimed hunting binding information.

However applicant's claimed invention recites that the binding information being transferred from the home agent of the mobile terminal to the correspondent terminal.

In contrast Leung states that the mobility binding table is used in the home agents of the invention (col. 11, lines 48-67). Leung also only describes that a standby home agent is introduced as a backup of a home agent and the binding tables held respectively by these two home agents are synchronized with each other (col. 4, lines 61- col. 5, line 11). The Figures of Leung also support only the sending registration from foreign agent to home agent, for example figure 1A

Leung fails to state or suggests that the binding information being transferred from the home agent of the mobile terminal to the correspondent terminal.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully requested the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21 and should likewise be allowed for at least the foregoing reasons and because claim 22 recites:

"tunneling the data packet from the correspondent terminal to the mobile terminal based on the binding information"

The Office Action points to col. 7, lines 26- col. 8, line 6, however in this section Leung teaches that the home agent either active or standby will tunnel the packet to the Mobile Node.

In contrast applicant claims "a proxy correspondent node provided between a correspondent terminal and a home agent" and the proxy correspondent node "tunneling the data packet from the correspondent terminal to the mobile terminal based on the binding information."


Thus Leung teaches the home agent tunneling the packet to the Mobile Node, while applicant's proxy correspondent node between the correspondent terminal and the home agent is tunneling the data packet.

Claim 52 and dependent claim 53 include similar distinguishing features as claim 21 and should likewise be allowed. For example: the binding information being transferred from the home agent of the mobile terminal to the correspondent terminal.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJO 17.290 (100794-11414)